

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/787,312	Applicant(s) GOROVOY ET AL.	
	Examiner Dean O. Takaoka	Art Unit 2817	

All Participants:

(1) Dean O. Takaoka.

(2) Isis E Caulder.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 September 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims discussed:

1,12

Prior art documents discussed:

Hettlage, Mayer and Spinner

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was the position of the Examiner that the amendments and arguments contained in Applicant's amendment dated August 23, 2007 were not persuasive and did not patentably distinguish over the prior art of record. It was agreed to further define independent claims 1 and 12 to further distinguish Applicant's features over the applied prior art of record. It was agreed changes would be made by Examiner's amendment in order to place the claims in condition for allowance.